DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 431 056 UD 032 957

AUTHOR Gasman, Marybeth
TITLE Nurturing African American Scholars and Leaders: An Explanation of Fisk University's Basic College Program (1951-1956).
PUB DATE 1999-00-00
NOTE 21p.
PUB TYPE Historical Materials (060) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Black Colleges; *Black Students; College Students; *Early Admission; Educational Environment; High School Students; *Leadership Training; Models; *Scholarship; School Entrance Age
IDENTIFIERS African Americans; *Fisk University TN

ABSTRACT

Fisk University, under the administration of Charles Johnson, developed a Basic College program that might serve as a model for future efforts to advance student learning and encourage leadership and scholarship among African Americans. In the early 1950s, Johnson, then president of Fisk, created an environment that gave young blacks the benefits of integration. The Basic College Early Entrant program Johnson founded sought out exceptional high school students in their junior or senior years and allowed them to proceed at an accelerated pace toward the bachelor's or master's degree. In addition, the Basic College exposed students to a variety of national and international scholars, artists, and political figures in small group settings. After the first 2 years, Johnson expanded the Basic College program to all freshmen and sophomores, but kept the early entrants program as a separate entity. Eventually, the early entrants were placed in the same courses as the advanced freshmen. In spite of its success and the high academic achievement of the early entrants, the program ended with the death of Charles Johnson in 1956. Nevertheless, the Basic College program provides an example of an overall educational environment to stimulate and nurture the minds of black students. (Contains 21 endnotes.) (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 431 056

Nurturing African American Scholars and Leaders: An Exploration of Fisk University's Basic College Program (1951-1956)

By Marybeth Gasman

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL BY
Marybeth Gasman
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

UD032957

Nurturing African American Scholars and Leaders: An Exploration of Fisk University's Basic College Program (1951-1956)

Marybeth Gasman, author

> Charles Johnson believed in the whole concept of identifying young Black bright kids who thrive in an environment where they have good teachers and encouragement. He was trying to demonstrate too that it did not matter what your color was as long as you have the potential[1]

Not wholly convinced, in the early 1950s, of the will of the Supreme Court to desegregate the educational system, President Johnson created an environment at Fisk that gave young Blacks the benefits of integration. At Fisk, prominent artists and intellectuals of varying races and nationalities came together to nurture students and encourage scholarship. According to one of these students, Jane Fort,

> During Dr. Johnson's presidency, the campus burst with intellectual activity: the faculty was full of well-trained professors, the best in their fields. There was regular convocation with national and international speakers, the impact of the summers' various meetings, including, but not limited to the Race Relations Institute, was felt throughout the academic year. The campus also enjoyed a concert series that brought international performers and the annual Spring Music and Arts Festival in which the humanities were celebrated through performances by our campus groups and national and international presenters as well. During my years, we heard from and had an opportunity to meet and interact with such notables as W.E.B. Du Bois, Martin Luther King, Jr.,

UD032957

Langston Hughes and so many others that we may have taken it all too much for granted.

Those who study African American higher education and philanthropy tend to look at the actions and motives of the White philanthropists rather than exploring the agency of Black college presidents.[2] This paper, however, will approach the study of black higher education from the perspective of Black leaders, demonstrating their ability to generate original ideas and solicit the funding to support them. Much of the previous scholarship on the topic of Charles S. Johnson has tended to evaluate his success or failure as a president based on the question of whether or not he was a pawn of philanthropy. In taking this perspective, scholars lose sight of the specific accomplishments and innovations of Johnson's administration. The purpose of this paper will be to explore the ways in which Johnson's Basic College program might serve as a model for future efforts to advance student learning and encourage leadership and scholarship among African Americans. This paper will uncover the ways in which a historically Black college was able to identify and nurture potential among young African Americans. This knowledge can be applied to all types of institutions that seek to foster diversity in the pursuit of scholarship.

Among many of the students on campus, Johnson is remembered as a legendary figure. They were aware of his work with the Harlem Renaissance, his influential race relations institutes, and his research as a sociologist. Johnson's international reputation preceded him in all of his actions on the campus. Students also recall his calming demeanor and warm sense of humor. Most significantly, Johnson was thought of as a student advocate—someone who had the interests of students in mind and considered their futures as well as their college years. Johnson's ability to use his calm nature to

diffuse a situation is best described by Peggy Alsup, a former Basic College student,

> I remember one time when we were in Jubilee Hall and we were upset about the food – you know all students get upset about the food. We were doing all kinds of things protesting about the food. Heritage House [the president's residence] was just across the way from Jubilee Hall and we was [sic] having a small riot if you will – throwing stuff out on the lawn. And Johnson saw us and he decided to come over and talk to us. And I can remember as I was looking out one of the windows, 'geesh, I hope some of this stuff doesn't hit him in the head.' He walked quietly and came over and talked to everybody. I don't remember the details but I remember he defused it. He didn't criticize us or get us suspended. He made us some promises that we all agreed to. That was his style....I don't care what the problem was –once he got there his calm, elegant manner just calmed the waters. There was nothing for you to do but just forget about it.[3]

President Johnson was also relaxed and understanding when Fisk had its first "panty raid." Upon hearing of the incident, the faculty were ready to eject the students from the University. According to Prince Rivers, however, "Many of the students were the brightest and the best that Fisk had produced." After much discussion and a bit of arm-twisting, Johnson was able to talk the faculty into accepting an alternative punishment. The students would be allowed to graduate but would not be permitted to march with their class in the ceremony. Johnson felt that a relatively harmless student prank should not have lifelong consequences. By forbidding the students to march, he would punish them, but allow them to move on as productive citizens and to gain

respectable employment.[4]

If Johnson was well-liked for his student-friendly positions, he was not so well-liked for his style. Although he had a lot to say, Johnson was not a particularly good public speaker. According to Prince Rivers, "He had a low key monotonous voice." Johnson's lack of oratorical skill was most likely due to his reserved personality, best described by former student Vivian Norton:

> I remember Dr. Johnson as a man who was somewhat shy around the students—not as comfortable as some.... He was a scholar at heart, with all the traditional scholarly stereotypes appearing to be attributable to him. He seemed to avoid most individual contact with students; but he was always kind and courtly, if [not] somewhat distant, when that contact was inevitable.

However, he was a brilliant writer, and according to Mr. Rivers, "if you could read it [the speech] you would be much better off reading it on your own rather than hearing it."[5]

And many of the students would have been interested in reading the speeches. While university students in general are not wholly cognizant of their presidents' goals for the institution, Fisk students were an exception. Students during Johnson's presidential tenure were curious about his motivations and interested in his personal philosophy for running the University. According to Prince Rivers, Johnson wanted Fisk to be at the forefront of higher education. He shared his plans to do this with students mainly through speeches. He enjoyed speculating about the future based on his knowledge and research. Often, Johnson would begin a speech to students by saying "Ten years from now..." He would discuss the changes that he saw in the future

and his intended revisions to the Fisk academic program.[6]

One of his goals for academic and social preparation at Fisk was to build students up in "terms of their own strength and identity." According to Peggy Alsup, Johnson was fond of saying "'This is where we come to give these kids the strength that they are going to need to confront the rest of the world.'" Much different from the challenge found in the Civil Rights movement—to prepare students for civil disobedience—Johnson's focus was on "nurturing and incubating" students: giving them academic tools, self-worth, and confidence. Johnson would say "there are many different ways to make change." His way often involved research and cooperation between Blacks and Whites—the two most stressed items on his agenda for students. Although different from the activism of previous Black leaders such as W.E.B. Du Bois and Marcus Garvey and later leaders such as Martin Luther King, Jr. and Malcolm X, Johnson's approach earned the respect of students. According to Jane Fort, "Johnson's experiences prior to coming to Fisk, his integration of White faculty and students on campus and his establishment of an on-going dialogue experienced through the Race Relations Institute, put him at the forefront of leaders on the scene in the 1950's." Further, Fort adds, "Given the fact that lynchings were still acknowledged occurrences then, Dr. Johnson's activities were indeed 'activist.'" Any sign of movement toward a more equal role for Blacks was seen as threatening to Southern Whites. Prince Rivers does not define Johnson's activism as the classical type, but as intellectual activism.

> In a sense he had a history of activism with the *Crisis* [sic - actually means *Opportunity*] magazine, the Southern Regional Board which was one of the few integrated educational organizations in the South, and the race relations institute...he was not the type who would be out marching

> in the streets. He was aware that any action he took would also be a reflection on Fisk University. The first thing that would have an impact on what decision he made was that the retaliation would be against the University itself and not towards him personally.

Johnson constantly kept Fisk at the forefront of his thoughts and actions. The type of activism that he practiced was in line with the needs of the University. He had to think about the sustainability of the institution, the University's financial support, and the effect of his actions on the students and faculty. For Johnson, providing a first rate Black education within a racist society was activist.[7]

During Johnson's presidency, the stage was being set for the end of segregation. Through a series of court battles commonly referred to as the pre-*Brown* cases, some cracks were opened in the walls of segregation. However, these opportunities were on the graduate level only and their results were mixed. In the first case, *Sipuel v. Board of Regents of Oklahoma*, the Supreme Court required that states provide equal graduate education for Blacks under the Fourteenth Amendment. However, it did not specify how that education was to be provided. Ada Louise Sipuel, an honors graduate from the State College for Negroes in Langston, Oklahoma, was denied admission to the University of Oklahoma law school based on her race. With the help of the NAACP, Sipuel filed suit against the University. Her case eventually reached the Supreme Court which ruled that Oklahoma must provide an opportunity for Blacks to study law. The Oklahoma Board of Regents found a way of doing this without admitting Blacks to the White institution: they roped off an area in the state capitol building, designated the area as the "Negro law school," and hired three Black lawyers to serve as the faculty. Although NAACP Attorney Thurgood Marshall requested that the Supreme Court find

this unacceptable, the Court declined to take further action. The Court's decision in *Sipuel* did little to further integration of White institutions; however, the testimony by the NAACP brought more attention to the inadequate funding and resources available to HBCU graduate programs.[8]

In the second and third cases, *Sweatt v. Painter (1950)* and *McLaurin v. Oklahoma State Regents (1950)* respectively, the Supreme Court found that states not only had an obligation to provide graduate education for Blacks, but that the education must replicate the intellectual level experienced by Whites. In practical terms, this meant admitting Black students to the White institutions. In *Sweatt v. Painter*, Herman Sweatt sued the State of Texas to be admitted to the University of Texas Law School from which he had been rejected on the basis of his race. At the time of Sweatt's application, there was not a law school in the State of Texas which admitted Blacks, but while the case was being heard Texas hastily created a segregated "law school." The Black law school offered students substantially less than their White counterparts at the University of Texas. Its teaching was carried out by only four faculty members; its library had fewer that 10,000 books; and it was not even accredited. Sweatt's case eventually reached the Supreme Court, which held that "the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment requires that Sweatt be admitted to the University of Texas Law School." In *Sweatt*, the Court reasoned that an institution's character—which stems from its history and tradition—is an essential component of a student's intellectual experience. A "hastily created law school" could not provide an educational experience equal to that of a well-established institution.[9]

During the same year, McLaurin filed suit in order to be admitted to the University of Oklahoma school of education. Seeing that the Supreme Court's decision

in *Sweatt* would force it to admit Blacks to its White institutions, Oklahoma attempted to create a segregated learning environment within its universities. The state's policy allowed Blacks to attend White institutions on the condition that "in such cases the program of instruction shall be given at such colleges or institutions of higher education upon a segregated basis" (p. 639). The University of Oklahoma admitted McLaurin but subjected him to several humiliating restrictions. He was made to sit apart from other students in an adjoining classroom; to sit at a designated desk in the library; and to sit at a designated table and eat at a different time than White students in the lunch room. The Supreme Court found that this too did not satisfy the Fourteenth Amendment. As in the *Sweatt* case, the Court focused on the intellectual experience of the Black student, specifically the opportunity to freely interact with academic peers on the same social level in and out of the classroom. Both *Sweatt* and *McLaurin* favored desegregation but focused on the importance of providing all students with an adequate intellectual experience, be it at a predominantly White or historically Black college.[10]

The *Sipuel* case and those that followed it were part of a concentrated effort orchestrated by Thurgood Marshall and the NAACP to break down segregation at all levels of education. These cases set the stage for the landmark *Brown v. Board of Education* decision in which the concept of "separate but equal" was overturned. In 1951, the pre-Brown cases forced states to integrate graduate education only in very specific circumstances, i.e., if there was no established Black graduate school. For this reason, Johnson still felt it was important to increase opportunities at Black colleges. Even if Johnson was realistic about the eventual end to segregation, he was probably not convinced that it would bring about true equality for Blacks[11]

In an effort to provide equal education within a segregated society, Johnson

sought to create innovative programs that would nurture talented young Black students. He believed that by taking them out of an unfriendly and unsupportive secondary school and putting them into a college setting, he could cultivate a passion for learning and an interest in advanced study. Johnson also wanted to create a place of cultural ferment—a meeting place for Black intellectuals in which creativity would flourish as it had during the Harlem Renaissance. This was the philosophy behind the Basic College Early Entrant Program. Born out of the self-study conducted earlier in Johnson's presidency and funded by a grant from the Ford Foundation in 1950, the purpose of the Basic College was to seek out a few exceptional high school students (at the junior and senior level) each year and allow them to proceed at an accelerated pace toward the bachelor's or master's degree. In addition, the Basic College exposed students to a variety of national and international scholars, artists, and political figures in small group settings. The first Basic College students selected to participate scored in the upper 20 percent of all American students on general entrance tests. [12]

President Johnson founded the Basic College on the principle of individual ability and preparation. His goal was to raise the national standard for liberal arts education and to enrich a student's overall educational process. Further Johnson aimed to prepare students for graduate study and to create a nucleus of Black intellectual leaders. An important feature of the program was interdisciplinary cooperation among faculty members in order to produce a more well-rounded, curious student. Although acceleration through college was stressed, it was not the overall goal of the program. A student's age, general maturity and achievement on standardized tests were all considered as the student progressed through the University. During the first year, the Basic College students were set apart from the rest of the student body. They attended

separate courses, lived in separate residence halls and participated in extracurricular activities designed especially for them. The participants ate breakfast and lunch with other students but took their dinner separately. Members of the faculty and visiting luminaries ate with the group several times each week so that their meals were occasions for "interesting conversation and informal association between students and faculty members." Some of the guests included a young Martin Luther King, Jr., Langston Hughes, Georgia O'Keefe, Carl Van Vechten, W.E.B. Du Bois, and Paul Robeson. Students were not allowed to join fraternities, sororities or other "regular" college organizations. Because of their youth, most of the students seemed to benefit from their isolation within the University. For example, Jane Fort was pleased with her experience:

> As a participant in this program, I feel the BC [Basic College] "college within a college" aspect was extremely important and played a crucial part in the success of such a venture.... After the second or third year, we were integrated into the junior year of college. That initial "nurturing" gave us important resources to help bridge any gaps between our high school years and college. During the first year, we took our dinner meals in our residences and were joined by faculty and visiting campus guests for conversation and intellectual exchange. We were indeed most fortunate to be part of such a program.

Like Jane Fort, Vivian Norton feels that the "Basic College students bonded so closely during those years that the bonds have not broken to this day."[13]

By the second year, President Johnson's idea had blossomed into a well-developed program. According to Johnson, "Fisk has now developed a certain

reputation for this program which may prompt more families to enroll their sons and daughters" at the institution. However, the initial Ford Foundation grant of $120,000 was not enough to sustain the program. Most students were not able to attend the University with only the assistance of the Ford Scholarship. Initially, students were given a full scholarship of $705 each but later the amount was decreased to $370. Johnson faced the job of acquiring additional funding so as to maintain and enhance the program. With great persistence and some help from Fisk Board member William Baldwin, Jr., Johnson was able to secure three additional years of funding from the Ford Foundation:

> ...my notion was that we should be made able to continue the basic college subsidy to the end of the college period of the students [3 years] and provisions for new students over a sufficient period to test the value of our experimental program. That would mean about $150,000.

Adding to his success may have been the strong friendship that Johnson developed with Clarence Faust, president of the Ford Foundation. When Faust visited the campus he commented that "the program at Fisk embodied more of the elements of what the Ford Foundation would like to see accomplished than any of the other programs [throughout the country],[14] and the Fisk program was important to follow for its possible educational values."

After the first two years, Johnson sought to expand the Basic College Program to include all freshmen and sophomores, thus replacing the institution's core curriculum. However, the University maintained its early entrants program as a separate entity. In the plan for the new Basic College, Johnson outlined what he called his cardinal principles: "individual placement in each course according to the preparation and

ability of the particular student ...[and] individual progress at varying rates, depending on a particular student's actual capacity and achievement." The new Basic College assured that:

> (1) The weaker students [would] get two years of fundamental training instead of one year in English, Mathematics, and ... a language. After completing the more elementary course in English, for example, the students will proceed in the following year to the more advanced English course. They will thus have a chance to strengthen themselves very considerably in the skills of effective reading and writing which are absolutely essential to sound college work.
>
> (2) The stronger students will no longer be held back by the presence of much weaker students in their classes. These stronger students will be able to move ahead more rapidly, and, we believe, with greater zest for their whole college program.

Noting that "When a number of alert and quick minds are brought together, the whole group can reach a higher level of interest and achievement," Fisk also offered many different levels of each course including an honors class.[15]

As the concept of the Basic College changed, so did the early entrants program. As noted, the early entrants were initially cloistered on campus. This gave Fisk the advantage of being able to experiment with new courses with a select group of students. Many of the courses used in the new Basic College had been tested on the early entrants.

While the program was largely successful, there were some drawbacks which the administration sought to correct. For example, some of the older early entrants felt detached from the "regular" freshmen who were of the same age. According to Peggy

Alsup, a former Basic College student, "The Basic College was a very isolated, insulated experiment ... they kept us by design from the rest of the university." Further, the grading system for the early entrants' classes was much more severe than other classes. This resulted in poor morale within the group. With these issues in mind, the administration revamped the program during the third year. The early entrants were placed in the same courses as the advanced freshmen. However, the expectation placed on the early entrants was that they would perform distinctly better than the average undergraduate.[16]

Despite their young age, the early entrants excelled in the academic setting. In 1952, the Cooperative General Culture Test, a standardized achievement test, was administered to the group and to regular freshmen and sophomores. The early entrants scored better than the top freshmen by a wide margin, even though they had had one or two years less of formal schooling. Further, in 1953, the early entrants took the General Education Test of the Graduate Record Examination. Again, the early entrants were distinctly superior. Also of note is the fact that two-thirds of the early entrants earned scores which placed them in the top third by national sophomore norms. The early entrants also took the University of Chicago admission examination. On this exam they ranked among the upper 30 percent of all who had taken the test and scored above average in English.[17]

Although the early entrants were academically advanced, not all of them were mature enough to cope with college situations. Because the students were younger, sometimes only 15 or 16 years of age, the social regulations were stricter for them. Provoked by these restrictions, the students would act out. For example, two of the early entrants had "The Too Youngs" embroidered on their jackets. In addition, another

girl of only 15 felt that the ban on dating junior and senior Fisk men was unfair and stated, "I might as well resign myself to becoming an erudite old maid with a Ph.D." According to Prince Rivers, a student who, although not in the Basic College program himself, was close in age to many of its students,

> I think the program clearly demonstrated ... [that] students at the 11th grade were intellectually capable of performing at a college level. The question was not the academic ability but the social development of those students. Most of these students did have difficulty adjusting socially to their environment.... They were dealing with college situations.[18]

The success of President Johnson's early entrant experiment showed that students could "accomplish far more in the environment of the Basic College than they could accomplish in their high schools....[Many] can accelerate, saving time and also doing a higher quality of work than they would do without the opportunities and the competitive stimulus of the Basic College." Part of the success of the program was due to the interdisciplinary cooperation among faculty members and well-thought-out design. Not only did the students succeed as undergraduates but "better than 91% of [the] BC group has earned at least one advanced degree and nearly 100% [are] involved in some kind of community service leadership." Further, many of the students went on to become leaders in their fields—Hazel O'Leary, the former Secretary of Energy in the Clinton administration; David Levering Lewis, biographer of W.E.B. Du Bois and historian of the Harlem Renaissance; Ferris Patton, professor to genetics at Yale University; and numerous others. Further, President Johnson was able to cultivate a new group of researchers skilled in ways that he advocated. Through hard work, Johnson met his goal of creating a group of leaders who would move the Black cause

forward. He taught students what he believed—"the only way for evil to triumph is for good men to sit idly by and do nothing." In Johnson's words, the Basic College brought:

> a distinct addition at a strategic point to the nation's pool of potential leaders and ... [it] greatly strengthen[ed] Fisk University in its effort to improve the whole quality of its program and make itself a greater University. [19]

Charles Johnson tapped into the potential that sometimes lays dormant in high school students until it is stimulated; he gave students an opportunity to grow at an individual pace. He placed equal stress on a "student's academic achievement and on his [or her] whole development as a person." Through exposure to art and culture in a small group setting, the Basic College students' minds were engaged in the learning process. These activities were not supplemental to the curriculum but an essential part of it. Johnson thought that creative energy from writers, artists, and poets who describe the Black experience in their work could enliven the learning process. President Johnson's vision for the Basis College was lauded in 1954 when the *Chicago Tribune* took notice, stating, "Fisk probably did as much as any other institution to dramatize Negro higher education" and "Yale University's recently announced change in curricular set up is in line with the Basic College Program at Fisk."[20]

Despite this public acclaim, the Basic College early entrant program ended in 1956 with the death of President Charles Johnson. As with many of the programs that he spearheaded, Johnson neither made provisions for its continuation nor shared his funding sources. In words best expressed by Prince Rivers, "His style of leadership could sometimes be his biggest weakness in that Johnson had great vision and plans for

Fisk but he did not share those visions with his subordinates. So when Johnson died many of his ideas and dreams died with him."[21]

Although aloof at times, Johnson had a genuine care for students. When interacting with them, his approach was one of openness and flexibility. He was able to keep in mind the students' future when dealing with present matters. Unlike earlier presidents at the Fisk and those at some other HBCUs, Johnson treated students like adults. He was easily able to discuss all sides of an issue in order to diffuse it. This ability was indicative of not only his approach to students but of his general approach to activism—working out problems through discussion and cooperation rather than confrontation. The Basic College Program was an outgrowth of his overall plan for the advancement of Blacks in society. With the Basic College, he wanted to create a Black intellectual elite which was trained in his way of thinking, his approach to activism, and his methods of research. Students were taught to work from within the system just as Johnson did. Through his programs, he tried to tackle the same goal of integration that the Civil Rights leaders had. His aim was to enable individual Blacks to propel themselves to new levels through their own work. In Johnson's mind, this type of program, more than the desegregation of Southern institutions, would allow more Blacks to pursue graduate education.

Clearly, there are still gaps in the number of African Americans attending graduate and professional schools. The weakening of affirmative action programs further limits the opportunities for these students and tends to send a message that research institutions are not interested in cultivating scholarship and leadership among young African Americans. Traditionally the historically Black college has existed to provide opportunities for African American students where they did not exist in the

mainstream. This enabled these institutions to tailor programs—such as the Basic College—specifically to the needs of Black students. Predominantly White institutions that wish to restructure their programs to benefit Black students would be wise to follow the lead of Charles S. Johnson and his Basic College. These institutions must go beyond simply admitting the students and providing a smattering of courses that speak to the African American experience. In order to tap in to the students with the most potential and instill in them a thirst for higher-level learning, recruitment of Black students must begin early. Administrators need to be concerned with more than the number of Black students attending their institutions. Rather, they need to be advocates, as Charles Johnson was, who understand the point of view of their students and who have a vested interest in their success. Through interdisciplinary cooperation and diverse leadership, an institution must provide an overall environment that stimulates and nurtures the Black student's mind. What is needed to foster diversity within our institutions of higher learning is a group of scholars and administrators who are passionate about creating a place of cultural ferment for all students.

Endnotes

[1] Peggy Alsup, interview by author, 31 March 1998.

[2] William Banks, *Black Intellectuals: Race and Responsibility in American Life.* (New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 1996); Edward Berman, *The Influence of the Carnegie, Ford, and Rockefeller Foundations on American Foreign Policy: The Ideology of Philanthropy.* (New York: State University of New York Press, 1983); John Brubacher and Willis Rudy, *Higher Education in Transition: A History of American Colleges and Universities, 1636-1976.* (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1976) Henry Allen Bullock. *A History of Negro Education in the South, 1619-Present.* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1967); Merle Curti and Roderick Nash. *Philanthropy in the Shaping of American Higher Education.* (New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1965); Christopher Jencks and David Riesman. *The Academic Revolution. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1968); Frederick Rudolph. The American College and University: A History.* (Georgia: The University of Georgia Press, 1962); John Stanfield. *Philanthropy and Jim Crow in American Social Science.* (Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1973).

[3] Peggy Alsup, interview by author, 31 March 1998; Jane G. Fort to author, 19 March 1998; Prince Rivers, interview by author, 25 March 1998; Vivian Norton to author, 11 May 1998; Wes Norton to author, 28 March 1998; Earl E. Daily, interview by author, 22 April 1998.

[4] Prince Rivers, interview by author, 25 March 1998.

[5] Prince Rivers, interview by author, 25 March 1998; Vivian Norton to author, 11 May 1998

[6] Prince Rivers, interview by author, 25 March 1998

[7] Peggy Alsup, interview by author, 31 March 1998; Jane G. Fort to author, 19 March 1998; Prince Rivers, interview by author, 25 March 1998. Johnson's goals as defined by the students are corroborated by both faculty (Oswald Schrag to author, 30 April 1998; Mary Thompson to author, 28 March 1998; Marian Fuson to author, 24 February, 1998; Marian Fuson to author, 5 March 1998; Nelson Fuson to author, 5 March 1998; Nelson Fuson to author, 20 February 1998; and Gladys Forde, interview by author, 27 March 1998) and conversations between President Johnson and the General Education Board administration (Internal report by Fred McCuistion to GEB officers, 18 January 1952; Internal report by Robert Calkins, 6 March 1952; Internal report by Robert Calkins, 12 March 1952; General Education Board Papers, Series 4389-4399, 1, 3, box 419, folder 4398, Rockefeller Archives Center, Tarrytown, New York.)

[8] *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas*, 347 U.S. 483 (1954); *Sipuel v. Board of Regents*, 332 U.S. 631 (1948).

[9] *Sweatt v. Painter et al*, 339 U.S. 639 (1950): 629,849; F. Adams. "Why Brown v. Board of Education and Affirmative Action can Save Historically Black Colleges and Universities. *Alabama Law Review*, 47: 481-511 (1996); M.A. Connell. "The Road to United States v. Fordice: What is the Duty of Public Colleges and Universities in Former De jure States to Desegregate?" *Mississippi Law Journal*, 62: 285-360.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

[10] M.A. Connell. "The Road to United States v. Fordice: What is the Duty of Public Colleges and Universities in Former De jure States to Desegregate?" *Mississippi Law Journal*, 62: 285-360; *Sweatt v. Painter et al*, 339 U.S. 639 (1950); *McLaurin v. Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education et al*, 339 U.S. 637 (1950).

[11] *Sipuel v. Board of Regents*, 332 U.S. 631 (1948); *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas*, 347 U.S. 483 (1954).

[12] Charles S. Johnson to Fisk Board of Trustees, Annual President's Report, 1950, box 40, folder 5; Fisk Board of Trustee minutes, 16 October 1951, box 16, folder 10 Charles S. Johnson Papers, Fisk University Archives, Nashville Tennessee.

[13] Progress Report for the Basic College, 18 March 1952, General Education Board Papers, Series 1293-1300,1,1, box 140, folder 1294, Rockefeller Archives Center, Tarrytown, New York. Jane G. Fort to author, 19 March 1998; Vivian Norton to author, 11 May 1998.

[14]The Ford Foundation also sponsored early entrance programs at Harvard, Yale, Columbia, and the University of Wisconsin. Fisk was the only HBCU chosen to participate in the program.

[15] Charles S. Johnson to Fisk Board of Trustees, Annual President's Report, 1950, box 40, folder 5, Charles S. Johnson Papers, Fisk University Archives, Nashville Tennessee.

[16] Charles S. Johnson to Fisk Board of Trustees, Annual President's Report, 1950, box 40, folder 5, Charles S. Johnson Papers, Fisk University Archives, Nashville Tennessee. Peggy Alsup, interview by author, 31 March 1998. Progress Report for the Basic College, 18 March 1952, General Education Board Papers, Series 1293-1300,1,1, box 140, folder 1294, Rockefeller Archives Center, Tarrytown, New York.

[17] Internal report by Fred McCuistion to GEB officers, 18 January 1952, General Education Board Papers, Series 4389-4399, 1,3, box 419, folder 4398; Progress Report for the Basic College, 18 March 1952, General Education Board Papers, Series 1293-1300,1,1, box 140, folder 1294, Rockefeller Archives Center, Tarrytown, New York.

[18] Progress Report for the Basic College, 18 March 1952, General Education Board Papers, Series 1293-1300,1,1, box 140, folder 1294, Rockefeller Archives Center, Tarrytown, New York. Prince Rivers, interview by author, 25 March 1998.

[19] Progress Report for the Basic College, 18 March 1952, General Education Board Papers, Series 1293-1300,1,1, box 140, folder 1294, Rockefeller Archives Center, Tarrytown, New York. Vivian Norton to author, 11 May 1998; Prince Rivers, interview by author, 25 March 1998.

[20] A Report of the Basic College Curriculum Committee, 17 May 1952, box 15, folder 3; Bill Zeigler to alumni, 2 February 1954, box 15, folder 4, Charles S. Johnson Papers, Fisk University Archives, Nashville, Tennessee.

[21] Prince Rivers, interview by author, 25 March 1998.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE